

## CORRESPONDENCE.

**HINTON BURSON, R3, Roopville, Ga.**—Dear Mr. Pearson.—I have just finished reading The Fool-Killer, and it brought plain truths to my mind that I had never got elsewhere. And not only the last paper but all that I have received have opened my eyes to truths that are reasonable, and I got a lot of those old hide-bound fools in some close places just by using truths that I find in The Fool-Killer. Your view of an endless torment has ever been my view since I got old enough to have any sense at all. Some men with the furrows of age on their faces will laugh at me for saying the Bible does not teach that there is a place of endless misery after death. And I wish old Pearson was present to sit down on some old pine log and tell him just how it is. I can see through the thing, but I can't explain it like you can. I wish I was able to show the whole matter with fair reason as you do. I would change their laughter into studying. Let me tell you what I think of a man that believes that old lie. He has let the other fellow do his thinking, also his reading, that's what's the matter. Not long ago I was talking to a goody-goody Baptist, and I told him what I believed about that old lie. And he said: "Well, if I was you I would be careful and not talk that before my children." I asked him why, and he said: "It will cause them to be bad men and women." Then I said that I wanted my children to believe the truth about anything, and I had long ago been convinced that his kind had slandered God with that old falsehood, and I didn't want my children to be that ignorant if I could help it. Well, I just want you to keep on giving us the same kind of stuff.

**FRED SCHULZ, 74 Henry St., Brooklyn, N. Y.**—Dear Brother:—Pardon me for calling you brother at our first introduction to each other; but I am so much in harmony with your views as expressed in your very valuable paper, The Fool-Killer, regarding your political and religious views that I cannot help shaking your hand and calling you "brother." I don't know how you got hold of my address, but it does not bother me any; enough to say that I am mighty glad you sent me some copies of The Fool-Killer, for it has amused me every time it came to me. I intended many a time to send in my subscription, but I receive so much reading matter from all directions that I hardly get through with it all, and consequently forgot to send in my sub for your paper. Received Vol. X, No. 1, today, and being a very cold day I stayed at home tonight and read it through from A to Izzard, as you express it, and I assure you I laughed more than I ever did in any good vaudeville show. Your treatise on Luther is great; so is the "Sermon on Persecution," and the "Sermon on Souls." I agree on all points with you, religious and political, for I have held the same views for many years.

**R. H. DONALDSON, Watts Substation, Laurens, S. C.**—I am sending you one dollar for four subs to The Fool-Killer. Send all to Watts Substation. Jim, I like your paper fine. I was tickled nearly to death at what you said about the Cardinals. Put it to them till they feel it. Send me a few samples.

**JOHN MILTON SAMPLES, Mason, Ga.**—I want you to know that I have found the last two issues of your paper very interesting. Your views are sensible and well expressed. While I like the name "Good News," best, I agree that "The Fool-Killer" is more appropriate, considering the style of expression you employ. There are those who disagree with some things you say, but every one finds your paper interesting—and that is saying a good deal. Indeed, I find much to admire in you—your fearless, bold, sincere-sounding phrases are forceful and full of good sense. Your periodical is improving, and I wish you success. (EDITOR'S NOTE:—Thank you, Brother Samples, for your kind words. I knew you were a good generous-hearted fellow, but knowing you to be entirely orthodox (and a preacher besides, I believe) I hardly expected that you could appreciate The Fool-Killer at all. Most people of your kind are too dead set against my views to even acknowledge that they are interesting. It is a hopeful sign when leaders of orthodoxy will read and consider what I say. It shows that the light of truth is gradually breaking through into the minds of the people, and it will not be many more years until you will all have to openly acknowledge that I am right. Some of the most intelligent among you (such as yourself) are "almost persuaded" right now, if you would just own it. I know all about how hard it is to break away from the old errors of orthodoxy. I have been all along the road. We are all cowards, more or less, when it comes to a thing like that. We are not afraid of the truth when we find it, but we are afraid of what somebody will say about us if we dare to get out of the old rut. People who stand high as leaders in their church find it much harder to accept the truth than do those who have no "reputation" to lose. They think they never could face the scandal and disgrace of being called a "heretic." But they may have to face a worse scandal and disgrace than that some of these days if they don't get right.—J. L. Pearson.)

**AUBREY O. PAINTER, Roxboro, N. C.**—Well, sir, Mr. Fool-Killer, you haven't quite killed me yet, but you are pecking at me like a chicken in a slop-barrel. I am going to let you see what you can do for three of my brothers and some of my friends that have read your paper, and I think they like it fine. I am glad to say that The Fool-Killer is certainly worth taking. It is worth so much that it even teaches sweet potatoes to act the fool. I had some Fool-Killer papers in the potato cellar, and the potatoes had such good eyes that they read The Fool-Killer and they thought their time had come, so they rotted. Our old red rooster was walking around in the yard the other day crowing, "Hurrah for Pearson!" and I asked some one what he was doing that for, and they said they guessed the rooster had been reading The Fool-Killer. (Editor's Note:—You have got it backwards about the potatoes, my friend. Sweet potatoes don't have eyes or at least they have mighty poor ones. They couldn't see to read The Fool-Killer, and that's why they rotted. If they had read it it would have saved them.—Pearson.)

My guess is that the next president will be Hoover, Bryan or Debs.

## ANOTHER BOOGER-PATCH

Some poor, pitiful polliwog of an orthodox idiot who sails under the high and mighty name of "Rev. James Douglas, M. A." has flinched away and writ a book on the subject of Spiritualism. He calls the book, "Spiritualism: a Sin and a Crime."

Now that title is all right, for Spiritualism IS a sin and a crime. But the poor old fool completely spoils the effect of his book by writing it from the orthodox standpoint and taking for granted the immortality of the soul.

I wish to goodness I could get the wooden-headed warts of orthodoxy to see that the immortality of the soul is positively the only leg that Spiritualism has to stand on. Knock that out and the whole devilish scheme falls kersmash.

But we find that the entire strength of Orthodoxy is exerted to sustain this false leg on which Spiritualism stands while at the same time it is pretending to oppose Spiritualism. It reminds me of the old nigger Mammy who whipped her son Sambo for stealing green watermelons, but gave him to understand that it would be all right for him to steal ripe ones. And then she explained to him how he could tell when they were ripe.

"Ef hit goes 'Pink!' when you thumps hit wid yer finger, dat millyun am green. But ef hit goes 'Punk!' den hit am ripe. Now, you low-down, roguish nigger, see ef you can 'member dat nex' time you goes to steal a worter-millyun."

So it seems that the difference between Orthodoxy and Spiritualism is just the difference between "Pink!" and "Punk!" Old Mammy Orthodoxy doe not object to her son, Rev. Sambo, D. D., visiting the spiritual watermelon patch in the dark of the noon, but she wants hi mto bring home spooks that will say "Punk!"

Orthodoxy thinks the spiritual watermelon patch is full of good healthy living spirits all right, but is as mad as the Old Scratch because the Spiritualists are pulling 'em green.

It is a strange and unaccountable thing to me that anybody can be so totally devoid of sense and reason as to hang on to a theory which is not only contrary to the Bible, but contrary to all reason and common sense. But if people are determined to be crazy idiots and believe that the souls of dead people are alive, then why in the very mischief are they unwilling to accept the proof that Spiritualism offers? As Dr. Conan Doyle says, one problem that even Sherlock Holmes cannot solve is why the church should oppose Spiritualism in the face of the fact that Spiritualism is trying to estab-

lish the church's main central doctrine of the immortality of the soul. It is sorter like a starving man refusing to eat a nice, warm dinner when it is set before him. From the orthodox standpoint Spiritualism is the very richest kind of soul-gravy, and it looks to me like the churches would just fall over each other to get their snouts in it.

Try your smeller on this bokay of nonsense quoted from the above-mentioned book:

"There is no case in scripture of a human spirit being permitted to hold converse with man after death, except that of Samuel, who was sent in God's anger."

Samuel's big toe! There goes the ignorant fool trying to argue that it really WAS Samuel that the old Witch of Endor called up for Saul to talk with. And he says that Samuel was sent in that case because God was mad. What an awful conception of God! To think that God, in a fit of anger, would establish Spiritualism in the world, and then have His churches fight it all the rest of their days!

Why, you poor simpleton, God had no more to do with that case than you did. Not a bit. And the spirit that talked with Saul was no more Samuel than the daddy of Tom Watt's old mule was Samuel. The whole thing was the devil's work—the very same kind of work he is doing today in all this Spiritualist business that is going on. And old man Saul lost his life for that very act of consulting that old witch. If you don't believe it, read 1st Chronicles 10:13.

Now does anybody believe that God would have sent Samuel to talk with Saul, and then killed Saul for talking to him? No, sir, that won't work at all. When you try to admit that as ONE case where a disembodied soul was allowed to come back and commune with the living, you let down the bars for other disembodied souls to do the same. And then you have no right in the world to kick against Spiritualism, because it is only following in your footsteps—coming in through the gap you have made for it.

But if you have sense enough to put up that gap and teach the truth that dead people are DEAD, and that they CANNOT come back and communicate with the living, then Spiritualism has no place to come in at. You have slammed the door in its face and knocked the last prop from under it.

Now, Mister Smarty, which are you going to do? Are you going to keep on holding that door open for Spiritism to enter, and then cuss it after it enters? Or will you shut that door against it and give it no chance to come in at all?